

REMARKS

In the office action dated April 2, 2004, the drawings were objected to under 37 C.F.R. 1.83(a) for not showing every feature of the claimed invention. The specification was also objected to for informalities. In addition, claims 17-19 were objected to because of informalities and claims 1-19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential elements. Claims 1-19 were deemed to be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejections under §112.

In this response, Applicant has amended the specification and drawings and claims 1, 2, 8, 9, 17, and 19. Applicant has also added new claim 20. Claims 1-20 remain pending in this application. Withdrawal of the rejections and objections in view of the amendments and following remarks is hereby respectfully requested.

A. Interview:

Applicant's attorney, Thomas P. Canty, had a telephonic interview with Examiner Pape on June 29, 2004, in which the objections and rejections and the grounds therefore were discussed. No exhibits were shown or demonstrated and no agreement was reached.

B. Objections to the Drawings:

The drawings were objected to because the trunk lid was misnumbered and under 37 C.F.R. 1.83(a) for not showing every feature of the claimed invention. Specifically, the Examiner asserts that the actuation device and actuator in claims 2, 6, and 19 and the third latching mechanism in claim 14 must be shown.

Applicant has amended Fig. 1 to replace the reference number "24" with the correct reference number --17-- indicating the trunk lid as suggested by the Examiner. Applicant thanks the Examiner for pointing out the error.

Applicant has also amended claim 2 to more clearly recite that the actuation device is "for use" in moving the stowage cover between the covering position and the stored position. Applicant has also amended Fig. 5 of the drawings to schematically show two electric motors underneath middle flap 13 and latch 32 on the underside of trunk lid 17. Applicant has also